



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,444	07/03/2007	Janet Boggs	CT0014USPCT4	5364
23906	7590	05/28/2010	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1122B 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805				MRUK, BRIAN P
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/587,444	BOGGS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian P. Mruk	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-25 and 27-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-13,26 and 36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/25/06 & 2/5/07</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of species G for the variable R_f and species A for the variable Q_s in the reply filed on February 12, 2010 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 14-25 and 27-35 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on February 12, 2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 26 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, in that it would require undue experimentation to do so.

Specifically, while the instant specification provides sufficient guidance for the skilled artisan to make and/or use moieties such as the specific R_f structures disclosed in Table 1 of the specification and the specific Q_s structures disclosed on pages 54-55 of the instant specification, the specification as filed does not provide guidance to the skilled artisan to arrive at literally millions of moieties/substituents within the scope of the instant claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo extensive undue experimentation to arrive at all of the possible surfactants of the structure R_f-Q_s, wherein R_f is hydrophobic relative to Q_s, and Q_s is hydrophilic relative to R_f, as presently recited in the instant claims. Accordingly, the examiner asserts that claims 1-5, 7-13, 26 and 36 are broader in scope than the enabling disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yamashita et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,368,972.

Yamashita et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,368,972, discloses a composition comprising a fluroalkyl-group-containing surfactant having the structures disclosed in columns 13 and 14 (see abstract and col. 13, line 8–col. 14, line 7), which reads upon the limitations of the instant claims. Therefore, instant claims 1-5, 7-12 and 36 are anticipated by Yamashita et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,368,972.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

8. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Toukan et al, U.S. Patent No. 3,933,819.

Toukan et al, U.S. Patent No. 3,933,819, discloses a fluorinated-alkyl sulfide (see abstract). Specifically, note Examples 1-5, which meet the structural limitations of the instant claims. Therefore, instant claims 1-5, 7-9, 12 and 36 are anticipated by Toukan et al, U.S. Patent No. 3,933,819.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

9. Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Otsubo et al, JP 11-29508.

Otsubo et al, JP 11-29508, discloses fluorinated compounds having the structures depicted in Examples 1-17 (see pages 7-9 of Otsubo et al, JP 11-29508), per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 1-5, 7-12 and 36 are anticipated by Otsubo et al, JP 11-29508.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 26 and 36 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-101 of copending Application No. 11/899,065. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending

Application No. 11/899,065 claims a similar surfactant compound comprising a hydrophobic R_f group that contains at least one -CF₃ group, and a hydrophilic Q_s group (see claims 1-101 of copending Application No. 11/899,065), as required in the instant claims. Therefore, instant claims 1-5, 7-13, 26 and 36 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-101 of copending Application No. 11/899,065.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

12. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 26 and 36 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-296 of copending Application No. 11/922,980. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending Application No. 11/922,980 claims a similar surfactant compound comprising a hydrophobic R_f group that contains at least one -CF₃ group, and a hydrophilic Q_s group (see claims 1-296 of copending Application No. 11/922,980), as required in the instant claims. Therefore, instant claims 1-5, 7-13, 26 and 36 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-296 of copending Application No. 11/922,980.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:00 AM-5:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian P Mruk/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Brian P Mruk
May 23, 2010

Brian P Mruk
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796